

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application as amended is respectfully requested. Claims 1-2, 4, 10-11, 13-17, 21-24, 26, 30, and 32-45 have been amended. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found at at least page 7, lines 1-22; page 9, lines 3-7; page 14, line 7 to page 15, line 7; and page 18, lines 12-20 of the application as originally filed. Claims 1-45 are currently pending.

The Office Action has indicated that Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as Prior Art. Applicant has amended Figure 1 to include the legend "Prior Art". Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 32-33 and 43-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office Action indicates that each of these claims contains limitations directed to a method for a "temporary identification number." The Office Action further indicates that each of these claims also contains a limitation of using the "temporary identification number" or "Bluetooth address" as an "identification number" in a connection between a first and second device. The Office Action asserts that "it is not clear what the identification number is used for." It is recommended in the Office Action that these claims be amended to more particularly claim the purpose of the "identification number." Applicant has amended claims 32-33 and 43-44 to further clarify the these claims.

In particular, claim 32 has been amended to include the features of "...the non-temporary identification number and index value being associated with the first wireless network device" and "using the temporary identification number as a wireless network device identification number associated with the first wireless network device." Claims 33 has been amended to include the feature of "...the temporary identification number associated with the first wireless network device." Claim 43 has been amended to include the feature of "...using the temporary identification number as a wireless network identification number associated with the first device." Claim 44 has been amended to include the feature of "... using the temporary identification number as a wireless network identification number associated with the first device." Support for these amendments to claims 32-33 and 43-44 can be found at at least page 7, line 7 to page 9, line 2 and page 10, line 4 to page 13, line 14 of the application as originally

filed. In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections of claims 32-33 and 43-44 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 11, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,633,761 to Singhal et al. ("Singhal"). Independent claim 1 as amended includes the feature of "anonymously transmitting information including the temporary identification number from the first wireless network device." Applicant respectfully submits that Singhal fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 1 as amended. Singhal is directed to enabling seamless user mobility in a short-range wireless networking environment. The Office Action refers to column 3, line 59 to column 4, line 5 and Figure 1 of Singhal as teaching "enabling anonymous communications from a first Bluetooth device 120." However, the cited portion of Singhal appears to only describe devices that may be used for short-range wireless communications capability. Further cited portions of Singhal, for example, column 9, lines 50-56 describes the use of dynamic network address allocation in a short-range wireless network. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Singhal contains no teaching or suggestion of anonymously transmitting information including a temporary identification number from a first wireless network device. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over Singhal and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of independent claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 22 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claim 1. For at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11 and 22 distinguish over Singhal and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 11 and 22 be withdrawn.

Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by "Applicants' admitted prior art." Independent claim 35 as amended includes the features of "generating a wireless network device address having randomly generated lower address part (LAP) and upper address part (UAP) fields" and "establishing a connection between the wireless network device and the second wireless network device using the generated wireless network device address." Applicant respectfully submits that Applicants' admitted prior art fails to teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 35. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 35

distinguishes over "Applicants' admitted prior art" and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(a) rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn.

Claims 42-44 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,758,282 to Yamashina et al. ("Yamashina"). Independent claim 42 as amended includes the feature of "anonymously transmitting the messages from the first wireless network device to the second wireless network device." Independent claim 43 as amended includes the feature "anonymously establishing a connection between the first wireless network device and the second wireless network device using the temporary identification number as a wireless network identification number associated with the first device." Independent claim 44 as amended includes the feature of "establishing anonymous communications between the first and the second wireless network devices using the temporary identification number as a wireless network identification number associated with the first device." Yamashina describes updating a network address when an address conflict between radio terminals is generated by requesting a terminal to update the address and receiving an updated address. Applicant respectfully submits that Yamashina fails to teach or suggest anonymous communications between a first wireless device and a second wireless device. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 42-44 distinguish over Yamashina and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejections of independent claims 42-44 be withdrawn.

Claim 45 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,252,884 to Hunter ("Hunter"). Independent claim 45 as amended includes the feature of "anonymously transmitting messages from the first wireless network device to the second wireless network device including the identity token therein as a wireless network identification number." Hunter describes a process for dynamically configuring a wireless computer network in which each computer that is to participate in the dynamic network continuously broadcasts its address to any other computer within range of the wireless network hardware. Applicant respectfully submits that Hunter fails to teach or suggest anonymously transmitting messages from a first wireless network device to a second wireless network device. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 45 distinguishes over Hunter and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of independent claim 45 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 24-26, 28-29, 32-33, and 38-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashina in view of Singhal. Independent claim 1 as amended includes the feature of "anonymously transmitting information including the temporary identification number from the first wireless network device." Independent claim 26 as amended includes the feature of "anonymously transmitting the messages from the first wireless network device to the second wireless network device." Independent claim 32 as amended includes the feature of "anonymously establishing a second connection between the first wireless network device and the second wireless network device using the temporary identification number as a wireless network device identification number associated with the first wireless network device." Independent claim 33 as amended includes the feature of "establishing anonymous communications between the first and the second wireless network devices using the temporary identification number as a wireless network device identification number, the temporary identification number associated with the first wireless network device." Independent claim 38 as amended includes the feature of "a module for obtaining a temporary identification number for use in anonymous communication from the wireless network device to the second wireless network device." For similar reasons as those discussed with respect to claims 42-44, Applicant respectfully submits that Yamashina fails to teach or suggest at least these features of independent claims 1, 26, 32, 33, and 38. Applicant respectfully submits that Singhal also fails to teach or suggest these features. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 26, 32, 33, and 38 distinguish over Yamashina in view of Singhal and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of independent claims 1, 26, 32, 33, and 38 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4, 6-9, 24-25, 28-29, and 39-41 are dependent upon and include the features of their respective independent claims 1, 26, and 38. For at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent claims 1, 26, and 38, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-4, 6-9, 24-25, 28-29, and 39-41 also distinguish over Yamashina in view of Singhal and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims -4, 6-9, 24-25, 28-29, and 39-41 be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 27, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashina in view of Singhal as applied to claims 1-4, 6-9, 24-26, 28-29, 32-33, and 38-41, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,503 to Pelissier et al ("Pelissier"). Claims 5 is dependent upon and includes the features of independent claim 1. As discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Yamashina in view of Singhal fails to teach or suggest at least the feature

of independent claim 1 of "anonymously transmitting information including the temporary identification number from the first wireless network device." Claims 27 and 30 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claim 26. As discussed with respect to independent claim 26, Yamashina in view of Singhal fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of independent claim 26 of "anonymously transmitting the messages from the first wireless network device to the second wireless network device." The cited portion of Pelissier describes a method of device initialization in a network in which MAC addresses are reassigned to devices. Applicant respectfully submits Pelissier also fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 1 and 26. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 27, and 30 distinguish over Yamashina in view of Singhal and further in view of Pelissier and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 5, 27, and 30 be withdrawn.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal in view of Pelissier. Claim 10 is dependent upon and includes the features of independent claim 1. As previously discussed, Singhal fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of independent claim 1 of "anonymously transmitting information including the temporary identification number from the first wireless network device." As discussed with respect to claims 5, 27, and 30, Pelissier also fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 1. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 distinguishes over Singhal in view of Pelissier and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 11-12, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,246,670 to Karlsson et al. ("Karlsson") in view of Singhal. The cited portion of Karlsson describes dynamically assigning network addresses selected from an address list. Applicant respectfully submits that Karlsson fails to teach or suggest the feature of independent claim 1 of "anonymously transmitting information including the temporary identification number from the first wireless network device." As previously discussed, Singhal also fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 1. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over Karlsson in view of Singhal and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. Claims 11-12 and 21 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claim 1. For at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant

respectfully submits that claims 11-12 and 21 distinguish over Karlsson in view of Singhal and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 11-12 and 21 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 11, 18-19, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter in view of Singhal. Applicant respectfully submits that Hunter fails to teach or suggest the feature of independent claim 1 of "anonymously transmitting information including the temporary identification number from the first wireless network device." As previously discussed, Singhal also fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Hunter also fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of independent claim 34 of "anonymously transmitting messages from the first wireless network device to the second wireless network device including the identity token therein as a wireless network device identification number." Applicant respectfully submits that Singhal also fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 34. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 34 distinguish over Hunter in view of Singhal and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of independent claims 1 and 34 be withdrawn. Claims 11 and 18-19 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed with respect to independent 1, Applicant respectfully submits claims 11 and 18-19 distinguish over Hunter in view of Singhal and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 11 and 18-19 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 11, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,778,528 to Blair et al. ("Blair") in view of Singhal. Blair generally describes dynamic IP address assignment to computer systems accessed from a packet network by dial-out calls. Applicant respectfully submits that Blair fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of independent claim 1 of "anonymously transmitting information including the temporary identification number from the first wireless network device." As previously discussed, Singhal also fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over Blair in view of Singhal and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of independent claim 1 be withdrawn. Claims 11 and 20 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed with respect to independent 1, Applicant respectfully submits claims 11 and 20 also distinguish over Blair in view of Singhal and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 11 and 20 be withdrawn.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karlsson in view of Singhal as applied to claims 1, 11-12, and 21, and further in view of Yamashina. Claim 13 is dependent upon and includes the features of independent claim 1. As previously discussed neither Karlsson, Singhal, nor Yamashina teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 distinguishes over Karlsson in view of Singhal and further in view of Yamashina and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn.

Claims 14 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karlsson in view of Singhal as applied to claim 1, 11-12, and 21, and further in view of "Applicants' admitted prior art." Claims 14 and 16-17 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claim 1. As previously discussed neither Karlsson, Singhal, nor "Applicants' admitted prior art" teach or suggest the aforementioned features of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14 and 16-17 distinguish over Karlsson in view of Singhal and further in view of "Applicants' admitted prior art" and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 14 and 16-17 be withdrawn.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karlsson in view of Singhal and "Applicants' admitted prior art" as applied to claims 14 and 16-17, and further in view of Pelissier. Claims 15 is dependent upon and includes the features of independent claim 1. As previously discussed neither Karlsson, Singhal, "Applicants' admitted prior art", nor Pelissier teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 distinguishes over Karlsson in view of Singhal and "Applicants' admitted prior art" and further in view of Pelissier and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

Claims 36-37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Applicants' admitted prior art" in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0191560 A1 to Yokoo et al. ("Yokoo"). Claims 36-37 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claim 35. As discussed with respect to independent claim 35, Applicants' admitted prior art fails to teach or suggest at least the features of independent claim 35 of "generating a wireless network device address having randomly generated lower address part (LAP) and upper address part (UAP) fields" and "establishing a connection between the

wireless network device and the second wireless network device using the generated wireless network device address." Yokoo describes an electronic pet system in which a master device and a slave device may communicate with encrypted communications. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Yokoo also fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned features of independent claim 35. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 36-37 distinguish over "Applicants' admitted prior art" in view of Yokoo and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 36-37 be withdrawn.

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashina in view of Singhal as applied to claim 1-4, 6-9, 24-26, 28-29, 32-33, and 38-41, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0059614 A1 to Lipsanen et al. ("Lipsanen"). Claim 23 is dependent upon and includes the features of independent claim 1. As previously discussed, Yamashina in view of Singhal fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of independent claim 1 of "anonymously transmitting information including the temporary identification number from the first wireless network device." Lipsanen describes a system and method for distributing digital content in a common carrier environment in which a terminal may be assigned IP addresses from a dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) pool. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Lipsanen also fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned feature of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 distinguishes over Yamashina in view of Singhal and further in view of Lipsanen and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 23 be withdrawn.

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashina in view of Singhal and Pelissier as applied to claims 5, 27, and 30, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,452,920 to Comstock ("Comstock"). Claim 31 is dependent upon and includes the features of independent claim 26. As discussed with respect to claim 30, Yamashina in view of Singhal fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of independent claim 26 of "anonymously transmitting the messages from the first wireless network device to the second wireless network device." The cited portion of Comstock describes that when a mobile node changes networks, it registers with a home agent, and the home agent updates a binding to reflect a new care-of address. Applicant respectfully submits that Comstock also fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned feature of independent claim 26. Applicant respectfully submits that

claim 31 distinguishes over Yamashina in view of Singhal and Pelissier and further in view of Comstock and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 31 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael W. Maddox

Michael W. Maddox

Registration No.: 47,764

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL  
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant